

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Subgroup
November 28-29, 2000
HISTORY RECORD

FAA Control # 00-02-228

SUBJECT: PT-Required on TAA RNAV SIAPs.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: The first iteration of the TAA concept included for clarity the charting of "NoPT" or "PT Required," as appropriate. Then a decision was made not to chart the procedures this way because it was felt that the AIM PT-related material supposedly addresses the issue sufficiently. Until recently, though, the 8260-10 continuation form did include the term "PT Required" even though it was not charted. Based on our ad-hoc survey of pilots we believe the TAA situation is much more complex (albeit much more flexible and CFIT-proof than non-TAA SIAPs), thus both the pilot *and controller* need to know with certainty what is presently implied by the standards and policies set forth by Flight Standards. This is particularly true when a PT is required from within the straight-in area, because of descent gradient problems. Requiring a course-reversal within the straight-in area is a contradiction in terms, but this contradiction need not be ambiguous. Further, the present AIM language about TAA flight techniques from either the left or right base areas permits the pilot to elect whether to proceed to a NoPT IAF or the course-reversal IAF. This is a sticking point with air traffic personnel and needs to be resolved.

RECOMMENDATION: The AIM TAA and procedure turn language needs to be rewritten. Order 8260.45A and related charting directives need to be amended to require both the publishing and charting of either "PT required" or "NoPT," as appropriate. AIM procedure turn language needs to address the "PT required" situation in the straight-in segment of a TAA.

COMMENTS: This affects FAA Order 8260.45A, the Aeronautical Information Manual, and pertinent charting directives.

Submitted by Captain Simon Lawrence, Chairman
Charting and Instrument Procedures Program

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

PH: (703) 689-4176

FAX: (703) 689-4370

October 12, 2000

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 00-02): Wally Roberts presented this issue on behalf of ALPA expressing concern that there may be pilot confusion with the current policy on not publishing "PT Required" when a course reversal is necessary on complex, sectorized TAA's. He further stated that the present AIM language about TAA flight techniques from either the left or right base area permits the pilot to elect whether to proceed to a NoPT IAF or the course-reversal IAF. This is a sticking point with air traffic

personnel that needs to be resolved. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), noted that the current policy in Order 8260.45A is in accordance with FAA's General Council interpretation of the PT issue; however, recent examples of pilot misinterpretation may require another look at the TAA issue. Bill also noted that it was assumed that ALPA was intending to use the "PT Required" annotation on TAA's as a stepping stone to so annotate every feeder route on all non-TAA SIAP's. Wally assured that this was not the case, they are primarily concerned with TAA's and recommended that Order 8260.45A be amended per their recommendation. Dave Eckles agreed to take the issue to AFS-420 for consideration. He will also refer AIM paragraph 1-1-21f5 to Steve Jackson, AFS-420, for action. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 01-01: Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), briefed that there has been no work done on revising Order 8260.45A, *Terminal Arrival Area (TAA) Design Criteria*. The revision is currently on hold pending ATP-104 development of a TAA training program for controllers. Development of the training program thus far has identified several ATC desired design changes that are under consideration by AFS-420. Brad Alberts, FPA, initiated a discussion as to whether adding "PT required" on TAA's would cause confusion as it is not so annotated on other approach charts. Brad noted that several past ACF discussions repeatedly emphasized that the course reversal was a required maneuver unless one of the provisions of Part 91 was in place. (***Editors note: radar vectors to a final approach course or fix, timed approaches from a holding fix, or on a specified "NoPT" route.***) Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), agreed that the annotation should not be required stating that this was supported by a FAA AGC interpretation of Part 91.175j for ALPA years ago. Simon Lawrence, ALPA, was able to produce a copy of the AGC interpretation and, after review of the AGC position agreed to withdraw the recommendation. **ACTION: Closed.**
